## REMARKS

This communication is in response to the Office Action mailed on February 23, 2007. In the Office Action, claims 1-22 were pending.

## CLAIM OBJECTIONS

Claims 15, 16, and 18 were objected to for containing informalities. With this Amendment, claims 15 and 16 have been canceled. Furthermore, claim 18 has been amended to depend from method claim 17. Thus, it is believed that the objection to claim 18 has been corrected. Withdrawal of this objection is thus respectfully requested.

## CLAIM REJECTIONS - 35 U.S.C. § 101

Claims 10-16, and 18 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 as being directed to non-statutory subject matter. Claims 10-16 have been canceled with this Amendment. Furthermore, claim 18 has been amended to depend from claim 17, which was deemed to recite statutory subject matter. Thus, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested. Thus, it is requested this rejection be withdrawn.

## CLAIM REJECTIONS - 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1-16, and 18 were rejected were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Wu ("Customizable Segmentation of Morphologically Derived Words in Chinese;" February 2003). Claims 1-16 have been canceled. Furthermore, claim 18 has been amended to depend from claim 17, which is discussed below.

## CLAIM REJECTIONS - 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 17 and 19-22 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wu. Independent claim 17 has been amended to clarify the subject matter recited therein. As amended, claim 17 recites a method of developing a corpus for training a language model implemented by a computer. The method includes extracting a list of potential words from a first corpus of text that matched defined words and rules. Furthermore, human annotations are accessed for the first corpus that provide indications of word type for the text in the first corpus. Morphological tags are provided in the first corpus indicating a morphological type of an associated

sequence of characters and a combination of parts forming a morphological sub-type as a function of the annotations. The method further includes annotating a second corpus of text that is larger than the first corpus with indications of word type for the text in the second corpus using the computer based on the first corpus.

Wu describes customizable segmentation of morphologically derived words in Chinese. While Wu describes annotating Chinese text for the purposes of word segmentation, Wu does not describe using a computer and a first corpus to annotate a second, larger corpus. It is submitted that the segmentation described in Wu are only used in human annotations and not utilized for annotating a larger corpus. In contrast, claim 1 uses a computer to annotate larger corpus that can be used for text processing. As a result, independent claim 17 is believed to be allowable. Furthermore, claims 18-21 are also believed to be allowable at least based on their relation to independent claim 17.

Applicants have further added claims 23-30. These claims are further believed to be allowable.

In view of the foregoing, Applicants submit that the present application is in condition for allowance. Favorable action on all claims is respectfully requested.

The Director is authorized to charge any fee deficiency required by this paper or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 23-1123.

Respectfully submitted,

WESTMAN, CHAMPLIN & KELLY, P.A.

By: _____

Todd R. Fronek, Reg. No. 48,516
900 Second Avenue South, Suite 1400
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55402-3319
Phone: (612) 334-3222 Fax: (612) 334-3312

TRF:tlr:rdg